

commercial launches. In addition, NASA flew one payload as a secondary payload on one of the FAA-licensed commercial launches. This year, two new launch vehicles debuted: the Lockheed Martin Atlas IIIA and the Boeing Delta III, each serving as transition vehicles leading the way for the new generation of evolved expendable launch vehicles.

Scientists also made some dramatic new discoveries in various space-related fields such as space science, Earth science and remote sensing, and life and microgravity science. In aerospace, achievements included the demonstration of technologies that will reduce the environmental impact of aircraft operations, reinvigorate the general aviation industry, improve the safety and efficiency of U.S. commercial airlines and air traffic control system, and reduce the future cost of access to space.

The United States also entered into many new agreements for cooperation with its international partners around the world in many areas of space activity.

Thus, FY 2000 was a very successful one for U.S. aeronautics and space programs. Efforts in these areas have contributed significantly to the Nation's scientific and technical knowledge, international cooperation, a healthier environment, and a more competitive economy.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 19, 2001.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2130

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) at 9 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3529, ECONOMIC SECURITY AND WORKER ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2001

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-348) on the resolution (H. Res. 320) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3529) to provide tax incentives for economic recovery and assistance to displaced workers, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-349) on the resolution (H. Res. 321) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 319 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 319

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported on the legislative day of Wednesday, December 19, 2001, providing for consideration or disposition of a bill to provide tax incentives for economic recovery, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

(Mr. REYNOLDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 319 waives clause 6(a) of rule XIII requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Committee on Rules.

The rule applies the waiver to a special rule reported on the legislative day of December 19, 2001, providing for consideration or disposition of the bill to provide tax incentives for economic recovery, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

The rule also allows this body to once again take up stimulus legislation, making it possible for prompt consideration of this much-needed and long overdue measure to create jobs and promote long-term economic growth.

This body passed an economic stimulus bill nearly 2 months ago, but our colleagues in the other Chamber have not yet acted; and in failing to act, we put American jobs and the stability of our economy at risk. The downward trend we now face has been over a year in the making, and it has been compounded by the recent attacks on our Nation.

Americans deserve this relief, and not just because of September 11. We owe it to them to proceed without further delay. I can think of no better holiday gift for America than an economic stimulus bill. It is imperative that we move forward at once.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this rule so we may proceed with debate on this time-sensitive legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I know we all want to finish the business of the House this week. I know we all have plans to be with our families in the days ahead.

But, Mr. Speaker, those plans and our desires to finish our business for the year should not serve as an excuse for Republican leaders to ram legislation through this body, legislation that is just plain dangerous to the U.S. economy and the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, and which they know will not be voted on in the United States Senate in the next day or two.

Mr. Speaker, the House has been kept in session all night long two nights in a row just to allow the Committee on Rules to meet at 8 o'clock in the morning to report martial law rules for a so-called stimulus package. Negotiations have been on and then they have been off and then on again.

But this morning, Republican leaders finally pulled the plug on bipartisanship. For Republican leaders, Mr. Speaker, it seems that ramming through another budget-busting wish list of Republican tax cuts, tax breaks for big corporations, and tax breaks for wealthier and presumably employed, individuals, is more important than the needs of real working Americans; a package, by the way, that will cost \$250 billion over a 10-year period, much greater than anything ever proposed by the Democrats.

The Republican majority seems to be more interested in scoring partisan and ideological points than in helping unemployed Americans and their families make it through this recession.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules is indeed an arm of the leadership, and the Republican leadership of this House is showing its true colors tonight as we consider this rule, which allows a bill to come up on the floor without anyone, except perhaps a select few, having had the opportunity to look at it.

This is nothing more than political theater. This is nothing more than a cheap charade. The American people

want and deserve better from their elected representatives, Mr. Speaker. It is a real shame that they will not be getting it here tonight.

I urge defeat of this rule and of the rule that will immediately follow, and of the so-called bipartisan and so-called economic stimulus package the Republicans are attempting to ram through this body today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I will congratulate my Republican colleagues on one thing: they have enough humanity left to be completely embarrassed by what they are now doing: leaving the gentleman from New York alone at his post to defend what is really the last step in what has been an ongoing Republican assault on the notion that in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, democracy with a small "d" ought to be practiced.

I guess there is one other thing I can say in their defense: they understand that this is a wholly unserious effort. If this were in fact a serious legislative effort, it would be an outrage. But it is not an outrage; it is a farce.

The gentleman from New York talked about how urgent this was. It is so urgent that now, 9:35 at night on the day before we are probably going to adjourn, knowing that, they bring forward a bill which no one has seen; and, of course, the less one has seen of this bill, the more one thinks of it.

They bring forth the bill under very extraordinary procedures. It is going to take rules. First, they have to have a rule that suspends the rule that says we have to have enough time to read the bill. Then they bring forth a rule when they ram this through that says there will be no amendment in order, no substitute, no alternative.

Yes, the Democrats will be given, as the rules of the House minimally require, a motion to recommit. That allows for 10 minutes of debate on the substance of that motion. So we have got the Republicans completely dismantling democracy.

And one thing is predictable, Mr. Speaker: the Speaker and every Republican will vote for this. I do want to congratulate my Republican colleagues, as someone who has been a student of legislative bodies. When the Contract with America was promulgated many years ago, one aspect of it was a series of constitutional amendments, none of which, fortunately, passed. Never have so many constitutional amendments been proposed since the days immediately after the Civil War.

All of them were defeated, but the Republican Party has managed to achieve a *de facto* constitutional change. We used to believe in the separation of powers, and we used to believe that the House of Representatives was an independent body, independent of the executive, independent of other bodies, and it was a place where Mem-

bers were elected and came and deliberated and made decisions.

By the extraordinary control they exercise over individual Members, the Republican Party has brought about a parliamentary revolution in America. We now have in the House of Representatives one large rubber stamp. Whatever the Republican leadership says is to be done is done.

I do not think ever before in American history we have seen such obedience. I do not know if we are allowed to pipe music in here, and I know C-SPAN pipes in music when we are voting sometimes. I want to suggest that what they ought to be playing is the March of the Siamese Children, because the monarch of the day gives his orders and down they march obediently. They are going to all vote for this bill.

We had an earlier stimulus. There is one other thing I can say about this stimulus: it is at least a repudiation of the earlier outrage they voted for. They voted for a stimulus very different in many ways previously, and they all voted for it, and they will all vote for this one.

As we said before, the way the Republican leadership gets obedience from its Members has wrought a constitutional change. We are in a parliamentary situation. The only place left on this side of the Capitol that Members can find checks and balances is in the bank accounts of the Members.

Now, what is it they are trying to do? Why did we not have a real stimulus package? Very simply, because the Republican Party has brought us back David Stockman. What we have had on the part of the Republican Party all year is a deliberate effort to create deficits.

They pretend to dislike deficits, but they regard them as their saviors. They understand that if we were to continue the surpluses that were inherited from the previous administration of President Clinton, there would be a demand for a prescription drug program. There will not be one now if the Republican tax policy is followed. We will be told we cannot afford it.

There would have been a demand for a housing production program to deal with the terrible housing crisis we have. Every witness before the Republican hearings this year said we needed it, but we will not be able to afford it. We will pull cops off the streets. We will cut back on environmental programs. There will be no money to help with sewer and water or transit.

What we have had on the obedient Republican side is a deliberate effort to reduce government revenues, not to stimulate the economy; but because they understand that if we were fairly able to debate these with an adequate revenue base, the public would insist on meeting public needs, to the dislike of the ideologues who control the Republican Party, and who control it so thoroughly that they are able to com-

pel the obedience of Members who will tell their voters something else, and then show up here and march down and vote the other way.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I came to the Congress as a majority member only 3 years ago; but before that I spent 10 years in the State House, overwhelmingly Democratic, where I could not even get a name on a bill as a cosponsor. Or in the 6 years before that in the Erie County legislature where I served in the minority, and having the opportunity to serve in leadership in both of those, I could hear the frustration of many, many years of being in the minority.

As I sit here, I have to remember and remind my colleagues that in 1995, when the Republicans became a majority in this House, they said that they would guarantee a motion to recommit on every single bill; take it to the bank, one bite at the apple. No matter what bill it is, we will have a motion to recommit, as we have today.

I would remind the gentleman who spoke that that was not always the case when the Republicans were in the minority for 40 years before that. But it also looks at the fact that I see hope that this majority will be permanent, because I am listening to grouching on process. I am listening to the fact we are going to ram through, and only the first part of this year, with a majority of six, we were not going to be able to pass anything.

The reality is that this House time and time again as a Republican majority brought together an agenda of new ideas and vision for the American people on the mandates they were given by its President and by its Members in the Congress.

So when I listen to "ram through" tonight or listen to some of the other things, it was only so few months ago when it was said of this body that we will be stopped in our tracks as a majority, bringing new, fresh ideas, rather than the failed liberal policies of the past.

So I am optimistic that the minority and some of those who will speak tonight see it as the fact that they are in a permanent minority; they are in a permanent minority because of some of the failed policies they have had over the last 40 years.

I look forward to moving through the rule tonight on same-day, moving forward to the rule to bring forth the legislation on economic stimulus in a bipartisan, bicameral approach so that the debate can be held, not for a half hour, not for an hour; but for 2 full hours we will have that debate tonight.

We can let America judge for itself as we conclude our work on the economic stimulus if we are moving forward in order to help put people back to work and create private sector jobs and take care of displaced workers, or whether we are going to talk about it and try to dismantle it here in the Congress.

I have faith in my colleagues, and I have faith in the American people that we will get the job done tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 2145

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I remember when I was in law school, one of my professors said when the law is not on your side, raise your voice. Sometimes it works. Sometimes it does not. But these new, fresh ideas, I guess the best time to get them is in the middle of the night when people are sleeping. These new, fresh ideas cannot stand the light of scrutiny in the committee with hearings where people can come and testify. These new ideas we have to wait until 8:00 at night to find out what is going to happen at 9:00.

These new, exciting, fresh ideas are not bipartisan ideas. It is just a couple of Republicans going in the cloakroom coming out wondering what will sound great on television because it is abundantly clear there is not one Republican in this House that is so naive that he or she believes that what they are doing tonight is going to become law. The reporters know it. The television anchor people know it. So what are they doing?

Well, they do not like the word rammed through. But what they intend to do is put out a wish list of the things that they would like to do for corporate America, the things they would like to do for wealthy Americans, and then at the same time says, oh, yes, we promised to do something for the displaced workers.

What does displaced workers got to do with repugnant tax cuts? Did not the President and did not the leadership here say that when we were bailing out the airline industry that we would have compassion for the other people that got hit by the war, that got hit by the recession? Yes.

When did this new, fresh idea for Republicans come up that we should help those people who are not working? If I recall, they were trying to get a bill passed which they did by two votes or one vote. And they promised Republicans, if you vote for this bad bill, we will do something for the unemployed. Then all of the sudden, it became a part of the stimulus package for the first time.

Now, we were willing to give on a whole lot of these tax problems because no one likes to go home saying they did not give tax cuts, but we really thought that the Republicans would find the same type of fresh, new ideas for people who were not working as they found some fresh new ideas how to establish some loopholes in the tax

code. But they did not do that. And I do hope those that come to the floor would start asking some questions.

Why could there not be a new, fresh idea that if somebody was not eligible under existing law for unemployment compensation that they would be covered? Why could Republicans not come up with some new, fresh idea that those people who were not getting an adequate amount of wages to keep their families together, to keep their kids in school, to pay the mortgage, that we would try to meet them half way.

Why did they not come up with a new, fresh idea that these people would be guaranteed coverage and not a block guarantee to be given to governors to do what they want but in health care. Why could we not get a dynamic, exciting, new, fresh idea that we only got to do this for a year? That is all the President has asked. Why cannot we take the existing health system that we have, where people who have been working and they are guaranteed that they would be getting health insurance as paid for in part by the employer, that if they lose their job, that the Federal Government would come in and pay 75 percent of it under COBRA, and if they could not pay the 25 percent, that Medicaid would come in. But oh, no.

If nothing is remembered tonight, I hope someone would ask the majority tonight what is the new Republican health plan? What is this refreshing new idea that they have to cancel the care that we have now? The answer is the Secretary of the Treasury will tell them how to do this plan. They have not the slightest clue as to the provisions that they would have to provide health care for the unemployed. But as tonight goes on into the morning and as they have make this up as they go along, one thing I can say for my friends on the Republican side, at least they know it will never, never, never become law.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of the great President Ronald Reagan when he would have to say, "There you go again." Because some of those new ideas we are talking about, I think that the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means was a co-sponsor of that with the Liberty Zones in New York and rebuilding the lower Manhattan and those 15 blocks that bring 15 percent of the revenue to the State of which we both hail.

That was a new idea. Maybe it worked a little different from some of the other ones going back to enterprise zones and other concepts. That was a new idea that was joined by many New Yorkers as a solution that the governor put forth and that many of us, including in my recollection, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

But when you look at the failed ideas, Mr. Speaker, the failed ideas, I

have talked about the last 40 years of liberal Democratic vision, the recommit proposal that the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has before us again, takes and raises taxes again. We spend our time trying to bring the tax rate down. We try to tell America that we want to have you invest your money, save your money but have you have control of it.

And about the time we take our eyes off it, we have the Democratic minority on a recommit bill that want to raise that top rate right back up and raise taxes. Make no mistake about it. This is not some slick or other type move around here. This is a move that if you vote to recommit, you are voting to raise taxes in America.

That is the same failed ideas that brought us a lot of problems. It is so difficult around here to look at tax cuts as part of the solution to get America moving again. And that is the problem we face here in our Congress is looking at philosophical differences from those who want to have a smaller, smarter government and let people have control of their own destinies and their own money, and those who want a large, bigger government that has more regulations and more control over the American viewpoint.

When I say with the Thomas legislation that is coming before us tonight, if we pass these rules, is a compromise. It is a compromise that not all Members in this House are going to want to look at. They are going to look at it as a compromise, a consensus. Not a Thomas bill, not a Rangel bill, a bipartisan bill that brings the solution of the best of those ideas before the House and to have it pass the House and move forward as it goes to the Senate and have the other body make its consideration and its will under what the President has brought in his leadership is the best bill possible to get America moving again to protect and create new jobs and protect displaced workers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I can see the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is right. To some extent we are trying to protect one of those ideas from 40 years ago that he so denigrates.

One in particular is called Medicare. It is about 36 years old. It is part of that 40-year history. It was when it was opposed by most Republican. They have grudgingly accepted its existence, but they continue to try to whittle it away, and one consequence of this tax cutting for the wealthy that the Republicans have indulged in is to endanger Medicare, and in fact, one casualty of their policy was that prescription drug program for the elderly.

The lock box to which they all pledged fealty long since went out the window, and we all now have clearly a

policy which makes the prescription drug program for the elderly impossible. The President has instead offered them a card so they can go get some retail druggist to give a discount out of the retail druggist pocket.

Yes, the gentleman is right, some of us are defending some of the ideas that came during the previous 40 years, and Medicare is a prime example of one of those policies which resulted from Democrats beating Republicans over that 40 years and the Republicans trying to get their revenge on it today.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) said this bill cost \$250 billion and that no Democrat ever proposed such a thing or to that amount.

First of all, by definition, I understand why no Democrat called for \$250 billion because they do not call for tax cuts or relief. They call for tax increases. No Democrat ever calls for tax decreases but tax increases, and by definition, the Democrats call cost giving working men and women their own money.

It does not belong to the Congress. It does not belong to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST). It does not belong to the Democrats. It belongs to the people. It is not cost. It is a fact that they do not have to send it here in the first place. So, by definition.

Secondly, in 1993, when the Democrats controlled the White House, the House and the Senate, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) claimed that they were going to have tax relief for the middle class, and they had control of the House, the Senate and the White House, and what did they do? They increased the tax on the middle class. They increased the tax on Social Security.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) said, oh, look at the Social Security and Medicare trust fund; In that bill, they took every dime out of the Social Security and Medicare trust fund and used it for spending. They increased the Social Security tax. They increased taxes for Americans and increased spending forever. They also took every dime out of the Social Security trust fund, increased gas taxes and had deficits forever.

So, no, no Democrat ever proposed \$250 billion worth of tax relief. They only asked for tax increases.

I would tell the gentleman, stimulus packages, why are big businesses laying off people today? Look across this country at the number of jobs, not just from September 11, but across the country because businesses are failing, and they need that stimulus package to go.

The Democrats call it tax break for the rich. The socialistic jargon that goes on here and the class warfare on tax breaks for the rich go over and over and over again on this side. Quit talking about Karl Marx and talk about stimulus package.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, Mr. SHERMAN.

(Mr. SHERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues a Christmas story. It is the dead of night. Congress is anxious to adjourn. Members can hear Christmas carols in their heads. Some are so anxious to leave town that they are willing to vote for a so-called stimulus bill, even though it was revealed just an hour ago—a quarter trillion dollar program that virtually none of us, or any of our staffs, have had a chance to fully analyze.

Ah, but the tale goes on. One party, acting alone, ignoring Democrats even at a time when national crisis demands bipartisan and bicameral consultation. One party reveals a \$250 billion program that they are understandably reluctant to debate under the regular rules, or to reveal in the light of day. Because, Mr. Speaker, two-thirds of the cost of this program, two-thirds of the transfers from the U.S. Treasury to the private sector, occur in fiscal years 2003 and 2004 and 2005 and 2006. Long after there is any perceived need for stimulus, we will be stimulating an economy which at that time may already be overstimulated.

For this is not a stimulus bill, designed to deal with a short term economic downturn. Rather, it is a permanent transfer of enormous wealth to giant corporations, cynically disguised as an attempt to help the victims of September 11.

Thank God for the United States Senate.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for yielding me the time, and I think tonight we are faced with a fundamental difference between Democrats and the Republican. The question is simply this: Would someone rather have an unemployment check or would someone rather have a job. It is very simple.

The Republican party stands on the side of jobs. The Democrats have the old kind of socialistic government knows best how to spend your money approach to economic problems, just like the country of Japan, just like the country of France, just like the country of Switzerland. When they got in their recession, they wanted to spend their way out of it, and as a result of such approach, Japan is now in its 12th year of recession.

□ 2200

They have gone from a 4 percent growth rate to a 1 percent growth rate.

Take the country of Ireland, on the other hand. It said, cut government spending, return the money to the wage earners, who made the money, and let them spend it. So they did, and

now Ireland has one of the strongest economies in Europe.

Economic security is not about tax cuts or spending more money. It is about jobs, and the Republican Party is working to create jobs, jobs for real people with real problems. These are people that I know.

There is Bob, who worked in an airplane factory, up until around September, and then he was laid off. Now he is the father of three kids and does not have a job.

Or Ed, who has a small electrical contracting business in Savannah, Georgia. He does not have any work right now, so he is looking at his eight employees and deciding which one of those guys he has to lay off and how he should tell them that at Christmas time.

Then there is my friend Mark, who works for the International Paper Company, as did his dad. My friend Mark, who is in his mid-40s, had put in 18 years on the clock and was a good union man. Now he does not have a job. Thank goodness his wife, on the side, makes birthday cakes for people. They decided, well, maybe we could start a bakery. It is not going to be as good a job, it will not be as high paying, but we cannot just sit around.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this package is about. My colleagues know this is about jobs. It is about real people. It is not about this wage here and this little Tax Code change there. It is about people in Savannah, Georgia, people in New York City, people in Arizona.

This House has come together after the 9-11 tragedy, but time and time again the Democrats in the Senate and some of the Democrats over here have held up the progress. They have dilly-dallied on airport security, they dilly-dallied on bioterrorism, they have dilly-dallied on the energy package. It is almost Christmas Eve. Why not give the people of America a Christmas present they would really like, and that would be an opportunity to get back to work. Give the American people a paycheck, not an unemployment check.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Chair would remind all Members that Members should avoid characterizing Senate action or nonaction.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The gentleman from Georgia made some interesting observations about delay and about not bringing matters to the floor. It was, of course, the majority whip, who hopes to be majority leader, who delayed and prevented the airport security bill from being passed for weeks. It was not the Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY).

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I would follow up on the comments of the gentleman from

Texas (Mr. FROST) regarding the previous gentleman's comments, my good friend from Georgia. He also mentioned that we are very close to Christmas Eve. I would point out to my colleagues that we are on the final evening, the last day of this session of the 107th Congress, but I have in my hand a copy of a headline from one of my local newspapers talking about "The Last Shift," and the death of a steel mill.

I am not so interested tonight, I must tell my colleagues, about stimulating anyone. I am trying to save people's economic lives. In October of this year, many of us sought to be allowed to offer an amendment to the last stimulus package to provide relief for legacy costs, to remove a liability facing the domestic steel industry so it could save itself after the International Trade Commission, pursuant to an investigation initiated gratefully by President Bush, that serious injury had occurred because of violations of our international trade law. We were denied that opportunity.

In November, a similar attempt was made by myself and others, who joined together because we felt this was also an issue not only of saving economic lives but of our national defense, to attach this relief to the national security appropriations bill for people who are losing their economic life every day. We were denied.

It is my understanding that some of my colleagues, as late as this evening, attempted to try to provide relief for guaranteed loans that are set aside for companies such as that enumerated in "The Last Shift," and they were denied.

The fact is, we ought to act in a responsible fashion to preserve the economic and industrial base of this country, our national security, and our jobs. From my observations, the underlying bill that is being debated because of the rule that is before us, does not do that. For that reason I adamantly am opposed to that. I am adamantly opposed to these bills.

I implore my colleagues to understand that if we do not act and act now we will lose the integrated steel industry in the United States of America. They cannot wait until March because they have already had their last shift.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, tonight one can only imagine the response of the American people as they listen to their holiday songs and Christmas carols. One can almost see in their mind's eye, based on the unfortunate but predictable reaction of my friends on the left, that it is the "most cynical time of the year."

If we want to go back and engage in instant revisionism of history, I suppose that can feed the hour's time; to pose for sufficient outrage, to con-

centrate on ingenious insults, to try to claim what has gone before. But the fact is tonight, and this point I will agree with my colleague from Indiana who preceded me in the well, people are hurting. People need help.

We have reached out in a sense of compromise and consensus to offer health plans now for people who are hurting. So let me see if I follow the logic. No, we are not going to vote for the rule. No, we are not going to vote for the bill. We will do nothing, and that way we will help our constituents. We will do nothing to expand health benefits. We will do nothing to reinvigorate the economy. We will stand here with our arms crossed and affect poses of outrage, but in fact be apathetic, disinterested, and play a game of power rather than putting people ahead of politics.

That is basically the choice tonight. When we strip away all the rhetoric and strip away all the revisionist history and take the finger that points and curl it back and put it into our pockets, the question remains: Are my Democrat colleagues willing to meet us halfway; or is this a give-and-take where we give and give and give and you take and take and take?

We have a chance to move forward. We have a chance this evening, Mr. Speaker, to get something done for the American people. It will require special rules, but the time grows late and the need is real. And to say we will respond with nothing at all, or name calling, or inaccurate, deliberately inaccurate, representations of the consensus plan that has been drafted, small wonder, Mr. Speaker, that those who look in will call this "the most cynical time of the year."

For once, Mr. Speaker, let me appeal to my friends on the left. I understand what happens in terms of the pursuit of power. I understand the frustrations. But tonight cast a vote on behalf of constituents who are out of work. Let us get this economy moving again. The American people face challenges, but they are not insurmountable if we work together. Support the rule, support the legislation. Let us get people back to work, and let us help those who are hurting.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules tonight denied Democrats, denied the minority party, the opportunity to offer a substitute; and that is why we oppose this bill. We have a substitute that is paid for, that does not add \$250 billion to the deficit. We have a substitute that provides health insurance now rather than much later; a substitute that provides real unemployment benefits, rather than what the Republicans offered. They denied us the opportunity to offer a meaningful substitute, and that is why we are against the bill.

We would love to vote tonight, and we would love to vote on a real piece of legislation that does not take \$250 bil-

lion out of the Social Security trust fund, as is being proposed by the majority.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I think some of our colleagues at this special time of the year need to get a smile on their face and feel a little better about things.

And, really, we need to give credit where credit is due. The House Republican leadership here got in the Christmas spirit ahead of a lot of other folks. Indeed, almost from the moment that they were sworn in last January. There are some Christmas sales underway, some pre-Christmas clearances underway by some stores I see here in town, but our Republican colleagues here in the House got into the business of giveaways long before any of these stores: giving away public lands to be mined on for practically nothing; rolling back health and safety rules; and tax breaks, lots of tax breaks, one after another for every special interest that lined up with a limousine at the Capitol.

It is the season of red and green. Well, red ink has been in favor here in the House all year long. This surplus is being used up by Republican borrowing to finance more corporate tax breaks. And green, well, that is the long green of special interest campaign contributions. And we have seen a lot of that this year too.

Even the Wall Street Journal this week labeled what is going on tonight as "a feeding frenzy among corporate tax lobbyists." Not to worry, though. They say there is enough for everyone. Well, not quite. Yes, Virginia, there may be a Santa Claus, but this year we are having a Republican Christmas. That is where Santa just stuffs the silk stockings. And for the working families of this country, they have a hole in their sock. They have heard of the story of Scrooge and of the Grinch, and their relief is slipping out the bottom of the stocking.

Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan warned us that "it is far more important to be right than to be quick." Well, this bill manages to fail both. It prefers to be wrong and to be late, very late into the evening. Who would want to do this in the light of day?

The stimulus stalled because the Republicans insisted on putting billions of dollars into tax breaks to set up various Christmas trees, as we call them around here, loaded with favors for special interest well-heeled lobbyists. Enron, for example, from my State of Texas, which has had its problems of late, under the original Republican bill would get \$254 million, getting its taxes rebated to 1986.

But only a lump of coal is left for working families who are out there wondering this Christmas do we buy presents for the kids or will we have enough to pay our health insurance premium next month. Who is going to pay the mortgage or pay the rent when the unemployment runs out? I think it

is time to dump the corporate lobbyists from Santa's knee and make room for those folks who have been working hard to build this great country and are now facing the problems created by this economic downturn.

Our Republican colleagues can wrap up this package tonight, they can slap a bow on it, they can call it a stimulus. But a pretty box that for most Americans is empty is not any present at all. This stimulus package, I believe, is a hollow Republican plan. That is why it is being rushed through under this martial law provision.

There is only one gift that our Republican colleagues are equal opportunity on, and they are going to spread that around to every citizen in this country, whatever their rank, philosophy, or party, and that is more debt. And we are going to get a heck of a lot of additional debt. We have got the Bush administration planning to come in here in a few weeks and ask us to raise the public debt ceiling because of schemes and shenanigans just like those going on tonight.

So I wish them well for the Christmas spirit. I know they have lots of it. But it would be nice if everybody in America could share a little more than packages wrapped up that only mean more public debt for them, their children, and their grandchildren.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

(Mr. WELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me this time.

As I listen here very patiently to some of the partisan political rhetoric and excuses of why not to do something, I would like to ask this House to come back to why we are here. And the question is, Do we want to save the jobs of working Americans? Do we want to give working Americans the opportunity to go back to work?

□ 2215

I know I do. I know my Republican colleagues on the Republican side do. My hope is some of our Democratic colleagues will join with us in saving American jobs tonight.

Let us remember when President Bush was sworn in, he inherited a weakening economy. The September 11 attack on America had a psychological impact on our Nation, causing consumers and business investors to step back from decisions to invest and decisions to buy. It has come at a terrible cost, a cost where we have now seen, on average, 8,000 Americans lose their jobs every week.

Today in the Chicago area it was announced that Motorola was going to lay off 9,400 more employees. Think about that. 9,400 moms and dads are going home this week to tell their children that they no longer have a job. I want to do something about that. I

want those citizens and constituents of mine in Illinois to get their jobs back. We have to remember that it was investment and creation of jobs that drove this economy in the past decade.

The Economic Security and Recovery Act provides that opportunity to invest in the creation of new jobs. I would point to two provisions. Technology created one-third of the jobs in the economy in the last decade, according to the Federal Reserve, and it was investment in technology that created those jobs in companies like Motorola. I note that two provisions in this package can make a difference, a 30 percent expensing, rewarding investment in computers and pickup trucks or automobiles. Somebody has to make and operate them. The 30 percent expensing will reward investment and creation of those jobs, giving someone an opportunity to make that product; and, of course, the worker hired to operate that product. We also have to recognize there are companies losing money this year, particularly as a result of the consequences of September 11.

While the net operating loss, the NOL carry-back allowing companies to go back 5 years against a profitable year, essentially get a little bit of a tax refund, which will free up capital so they can invest back in their company and protect current jobs.

Mr. Speaker, let us remember what this is all about. I want to go home at the end of this year, before Christmas, having done something for the people that work and raise families in the district that I represent. There is always an excuse not to do something. We are hearing those excuses from the other side. Let us pass this legislation. It is bipartisan legislation with bipartisan support here in the House, as well as bipartisan support in the Senate. Our job here in the House of Representatives is to pass this legislation and get America working again.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, normally I do not stand on the floor and talk about the tax cuts; but after listening to the debate tonight and seeing where we are at, and my frustration with this process, I do not know what part of reality my colleagues on the Republican side do not understand. America needs a stimulus plan that includes tax cuts, but not every half-thought-out scheme to shut down the vital functions of government that we need. The reality is that we are at war, and we have layoffs. We must pay for the defense of the Nation, and corporate give-backs will not pay for an increase for our troops or better equipment.

A laid-off worker cannot use a tax credit to pay this month's health insurance premium or to buy Christmas gifts for their family. They cannot use a tax credit that will come up next year, but all the other side of the aisle wants to do is give a tax credit. They

have a one-size-fits-all. One answer for every problem. American workers out of a job, we will give a tax cut. A Nation at war, we will give a tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, how do we pay for the war or assistance to the employed? It will come out of the Social Security trust fund and further prolong the prescription drug benefit needed by our Nation's seniors.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in the remarks of the gentleman on the other side, I just want to correct the gentleman, it is a refundable tax credit for the purchase of health insurance, contrary to what the gentleman's remarks were according to our information.

I think it might be a good time to talk about the fact that health care is something that the Thomas legislation reaches out to all Americans affected as they are displaced workers, not just a select few under COBRA, and there are an outline of a number of those.

When I think about middle America, the fact of reducing the current 27.5 percent tax rate to 25 percent effective January 2002 will strengthen working families across this country. There are a number of extensions of important pieces of legislation that are incorporated in this bill that are time sensitive, 2 years and 1 year, and permanent extensions of others.

When we look at this, not only have we looked across America, but the 2 months that the New York stimulus package has been kicking around that authorizes \$15 billion of tax exempt bonds and bonus depreciation deductions, reduce the recovery period for leasehold improvements, increasing small business expensing and increasing time periods for reinvesting gains, many of those are right in the aspect of revitalizing New York City and the lower Manhattan area which has been so devastated.

Also in this legislation is victims' tax relief. That is going to the Oklahoma bombing and the anthrax attacks that have occurred in this country.

I also remind Members before when we listened that this was not enough and this was a Republican plan, we look at the Thomas plan which is a consensus, a bicameral approach of reaching consensus, in many aspects supported by the President of the United States, bringing forth solutions of compromise that is not just one fashion. It is a consensus of the best ideas. If we pass this rule, we will bring this legislation before the House and then see the will of this body as we consider this legislation tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the same day rule and the underlying economic recovery bill.

The familiar sounds of the season, Mr. Speaker, silk stockings hanging by

the chimney, Republicans as Grinch. The demagoguery of the day. But, Mr. Speaker, I offer that this rhetoric does nothing for the 1 million families facing this holiday with the uncertainty, the embarrassment and the despair of being out of work at Christmas.

I know whereof I speak, Mr. Speaker. In 1993, with my wife expecting our third, with Michael, my son, age 2, and Charlotte, my daughter, age 1, I was out of work. I endured going to the family parties with the uncertainty of where the next paycheck would be from. I can tell, Mr. Speaker, it is a grievous time.

Yet some even on the floor tonight complaining of the lateness of the hour say we should not act on this economic recovery bill, they say we should only help the wage earner, but not the wage payer. But the truth is always somewhere in between, as it is in this compromise bill, a bill that provides 6 times the unemployment relief of the original legislation that passed out of the House, and also recognizes that the best welfare program is a good job, and we help to create and stimulate the wage earner by bringing those loyal employees back into the fold.

Let us not think about the demagoguery and the political advantage of the day, let us think of the moms and dads stretching to make this Christmas special, and trusting us in this Congress in both parties to pursue policies that will lead them and our Nation out of this present recession.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I want to throw another category in the debate tonight that has not been mentioned, and that is the grandkids. We can all agree tonight that we need to do something for the workers. I certainly agree with most of the components of the tax cut, that it does something to provide jobs. But I hope the enthusiasm that I hear tonight from this side of the aisle will be here in February and March when we have to increase the debt ceiling from \$5.95 trillion to \$6.7 trillion. I look for the same enthusiasm as Members are showing tonight for spending this money, I look for it in February and March when we have to increase the debt ceiling.

I agree with the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS), it is not much fun being in the minority. I agree that the majority can do anything that it wishes to do, and the majority are doing it again tonight, as the majority has done time and time again this year, and then claim to have bipartisanship; but that dog will not hunt. The majority can do it, and I respect their right to do it. But I also expect the majority to come to the floor and be just as enthusiastic when they raise the debt ceiling. I want the majority to

be just as responsible when they say to the people out there that we are trying to help tonight, the Social Security trust fund dollars are being spent for these purposes.

What I ask for, and the Blue Dogs have asked for, is to please pay for it. What happened to the conservative principles of this body when we used to stand on this floor and argue, pay for government, pay as we go. There is not one word about that, but we are going to have to pay next year. We ought to think about the grandkids as well as the unemployed, as well as those who need the incentive to provide the jobs. We are completely ignoring that. The chickens are going to come home to roost next year, and I hope the enthusiasm will be there.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Members are ready to increase the debt ceiling and borrow the money in order to return it for the purposes. I pray that the gentleman is right; I disagree with the gentleman, but the majority has every right to do what they are doing. Ramp it through, and then pay the consequences next year.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) for 3 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this Nation suffered a great tragedy on September 11. Our economy was slowing down. The statistical analysis tells us we probably went into a recession some time in the spring, and we have suffered tremendous numbers of layoffs, unemployment is way up. The best way to make sure Social Security is solvent in the future is to get the economy going. I think we all agree the thing that brings prosperity to this country allows us to have programs like Medicare and Social Security.

What allows us to have a strong military is the fact that we have a very, very strong and robust economy. But right now the economy is not good. We have got hundreds of thousands of people who have lost their job. The most important thing that we can do to get those people back to work is to make it profitable for the corporations that previously employed them to hire them back.

Now, I think the product that the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the White House and the leadership have put together is a good product that has, I think, some real potential to help get our economy going again; and, indeed, bring more money into the treasury to allow us to continue to fund all of the important things that we do.

Now there are some Members who are fond of calling this corporate welfare and just a big payout to business, but I would assert that we cannot create any prosperity here in this House, that we do not create jobs, that the private sector creates jobs. And the private sector right now is not creating any jobs. The private sector right now is laying people off. The best thing we can do is pass, at this time, an economic stim-

ulus package that helps American business create more jobs.

□ 2230

To characterize this as some kind of big payoff to big business, in my opinion, is just demagoguery. Our stock markets have gone down in value. The NASDAQ has lost more than half of its value over the past year and a half. Millions of Americans who we all claim to represent have seen their retirement portfolios devastated by what is going on. This is the exact kind of package we need to help get this economy going again and put people back to work. And, yes, ultimately in the end achieve security for programs like Medicare and Social Security.

I encourage all my colleagues to vote for this.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, tonight at about 10:30 I think what we can all ask for is a focus on priorities. I would like to be going home and presenting to the constituents that I represent some relief. Houston has been hard hit by unemployment over the last couple of weeks. We have certainly been well known in the news for the ups and downs in our economy that we have been facing. But what we have here tonight as I oppose the martial law rule and certainly will oppose the rule that has been promoted is that we do not have an establishment of priorities. And frankly what we have is a letting down of the American people and certainly those who are facing unemployment.

It is a terrible shame in this time of unemployment that we cannot provide a greater relief than what this stimulus package provides. I might acknowledge that there has been a lot of work. We also realize that the other body will not be doing any work on this, and so we will have nothing to give to the American people.

I noted with the good work that was done by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) on the Labor-HHS bill, they still could not pass a parity proposal for mental health. I do not know if it was about no money, but I do believe that we can throw this particular legislation to the wind because it is too much money. It is too much money in the AMT prospectively giving away tax dollars that the Federal Government can ill afford; not providing the bridge for health insurance that these unemployed persons definitely need; giving to the individuals who are unemployed a tax credit that they cannot afford. My State alone on the 30 percent depreciation amendment that I offered in the Committee on Rules that was not accepted will lose \$340 million every single year for 3 years. That is in this bill. They cannot afford to lose

\$340 million in revenue for 3 years. I offered an amendment to add \$5 billion to the bill to provide for the loss of revenues that the State would be losing. It was not accepted.

Giving 13 weeks of unemployment is not acceptable, Mr. Speaker. We need 26 weeks to be able to provide for those who are unemployed. We could do better. This bill gives away money out of Social Security that we do not have, and again taking money away from the States that they do not have. Our State of Texas faced Tropical Storm Allison. We are still paying for that, even with the FEMA moneys, and here we are taking \$340 million for 3 years with no relief in sight.

Mr. Speaker, again I believe that we can do better. I would ask my colleagues to reject this legislation. Let us go back to the drawing board and do better for the American people.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very clear choice. We have a responsible bill that we would like to vote on tonight, a substitute put together by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member on the committee. The Republicans have refused to make that in order. I assume they fear that our substitute is sufficiently attractive that it might actually pass. Let me repeat. They have refused to give us a straight up or down vote on the substitute put together by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Rangel). If they really wanted to act in a bipartisan way and if they really wanted to bring this matter to a conclusion so we could all help the unemployed people who need health insurance and who need unemployment benefits, why did they not permit a simple vote on our substitute? They know that the bill that they have proposed does not have the support of the United States Senate, so they are engaging in an empty act tonight. If they had permitted us to have a vote on our substitute, and if our substitute were to pass, that is quite possibly a bill that the Senate would take up and pass tomorrow. So the Republican leadership has guaranteed by the way they have structured the debate tonight that we will all go home without having passed a stimulus package.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to just bring the debate back to perspective where we are. We are on a rule for same day consideration. If that rule passes, it will allow us to consider a rule which will bring the economic stimulus package before this House tonight. I would like to remind not only the Members, but for those who might be observing the Congress, we have been here all year. We have had a stimulus package before Congress for 2 months that has been stalled in the other body. We are now approaching the holidays. We are now getting ready to conclude our year's

work and go back to our families and our States. So time is of the essence as we consider this legislation before us tonight and have the will of the House speak as we conclude.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time, and I would like to congratulate him on his management of this rule and the next rule he is going to manage after we pass this one.

Mr. Speaker, I woke up this morning to National Public Radio. Yes, I am one of those Republicans who listens to "Morning Edition" on National Public Radio. There was a story about three of the most prominent tacticians of the Democratic Party: Mr. Greenberg, Mr. Carville, and Mr. Schrum. Those three have authored a memorandum in which they talk about the need for Democrats to praise President Bush's superb handling of this extraordinary war that we are facing, and the American people are behind him, 90 percent of them, and the world has united behind the President. But in this memorandum, Mr. Speaker, they talk about the need for Democrats to attack George Bush on the economy, to attack Republicans in the House of Representatives on the issue of the economy.

Mr. Speaker, as I have listened to the outrage demonstrated by so many of my colleagues here, I wonder whether or not they have read the Schrum-Greenberg-Carville memorandum. I can only assume that they must have, because the attempts that they have made to block this legislation are really unprecedented.

They are unprecedented because this morning we saw the President of the United States do something that I have never known of before. He came not only to meet with Republican Members of the House of Representatives and Republican Members of the United States Senate, but he went that extra mile to meet with the Democratic Caucus. He is trying so hard, having met with the leaders of this body, Mr. GEPHARDT, the leader of the other body, Mr. DASCHLE and the Speaker of the House and the Senate minority leader. Mr. Speaker, the President has done everything that he possibly can to put together a very decent bill.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has just talked about the need for the minority to have an opportunity to offer a substitute proposal. Mr. Speaker, while the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) said we have denied the minority the opportunity to offer that, we in 1994, when we won the majority, guaranteed the minority the right to offer a recommittal motion. Members of the minority will be able to put together that substitute, and we will be able to have an up or down vote on it with the motion to recommit.

There are, in fact, Americans out there who are hurting. There are peo-

ple who have been devastated by what took place economically here following the tragedy of September 11. I believe that it is absolutely essential that we move this legislation to the United States Senate, that we do everything that we can to recognize that this is a bipartisan package. It is one in which we have tried to build support from the other side of the aisle on. I am convinced that as we move through this very fair rule and consider the next one and have consideration of it, we will be able to provide that much needed assistance to the American people.

I urge support of this rule, the next rule, and this compromise package.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 206, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 506]

YEAS—214

Abercrombie	DeMint	Houghton
Aderholt	Diaz-Balart	Hulshof
Akin	Doolittle	Hunter
Armey	Dreier	Hyde
Bachus	Duncan	Isakson
Ballenger	Dunn	Issa
Barr	Ehlers	Istook
Bartlett	Ehrlich	Jenkins
Barton	Emerson	Johnson (CT)
Bass	English	Johnson (IL)
Bereuter	Everett	Johnson, Sam
Biggert	Ferguson	Keller
Billirakis	Fletcher	Kelly
Blunt	Foley	Kennedy (MN)
Boehlert	Forbes	Kerns
Boehner	Fossella	King (NY)
Bonilla	Frelinghuysen	Kingston
Bono	Galleghy	Kirk
Boozman	Ganske	Knollenberg
Brady (TX)	Gekas	Kolbe
Brown (SC)	Gibbons	LaHood
Bryant	Gilchrest	Largent
Burr	Gillmor	Latham
Burton	Gilman	LaTourette
Buyer	Goode	Leach
Callahan	Goodlatte	Lewis (CA)
Calvert	Goss	Lewis (KY)
Camp	Graham	Linder
Cannon	Granger	LoBiondo
Cantor	Graves	Lucas (OK)
Capito	Green (WI)	Manzullo
Chabot	Greenwood	McCrery
Chambliss	Grucci	McHugh
Coble	Hall (TX)	McInnis
Collins	Hansen	McKeon
Combest	Hart	Mica
Cooksey	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Dan
Cox	Hayes	Miller, Gary
Crane	Hayworth	Miller, Jeff
Crenshaw	Hefley	Moran (KS)
Culberson	Herger	Morella
Cunningham	Hilleary	Myrick
Davis, Jo Ann	Hobson	Nethercutt
Davis, Tom	Hoekstra	Ney
Deal	Horn	Northup
DeLay	Hostettler	Norwood

Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Riley
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher

Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo

NAYS—206

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Ford
Frank
Frost
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez

Gutknecht
Harman
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoolley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klecza
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loftgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender
McDonald
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler

Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Shadegg
Sherman
Shows
Lee
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Traffant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf

NOT VOTING—14

Baker
Clement
Cubin
Gephardt
Hall (OH)

Hastings (FL)
Luther
Meek (FL)
Owens
Rangel

Stark
Wexler
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 2303

Messrs. BOYD, INSLEE, JACKSON of Illinois, FLAKE, NADLER, and SCHAFER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3338, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AP- PROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. LEWIS of California (during the debate on H. Res. 320) submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 3338) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 107-350)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3338) “making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes”, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, namely:

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 2002

TITLE I

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$23,752,384,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$19,551,484,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, perma-

nent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$7,345,340,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$19,724,014,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10302, and 3038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$2,670,197,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Navy Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$1,654,523,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Marine Corps platoon leaders class, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$471,200,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10305, and 8038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and for members of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses